

REMARKS

Claims 18-24, 30, and 48-54 are pending. This Amendment amends claim 18, cancels claims 25-29 and 31-47, and adds new claims 48-54. Claims 18 and 54 are independent.

The Claimed Invention

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as recited by, for example, independent claim 48, is directed to a laundry dryer that includes an electrode for a moisture sensor and a cooler that cools the electrode.

Conventional laundry dryers having electrodes on a moisture sensor have suffered from measurement drift as a result of a film that built up over time on the electrodes. The conventional approach to addressing this film has been to frequently clean the electrodes. However, these electrodes are difficult and expensive to clean.

In stark contrast to convention laundry dryers, an exemplary embodiment of the present invention includes a cooler that cools an electrode of the moisture sensor. In this manner, the build up of film on the electrodes is reduced and/or eliminated.

The Beard Jr. et al. reference

The Office Action rejects claims 19-20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable in view of the Beard Jr. et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” M.P.E.P. § 2131. In the present instance, each and every element of the claims is not found in the Beard Jr. et al. reference.

Claim 19 recites “means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least of one of the electrodes.” The Beard Jr. et al. reference does not teach any means for heat reduction at all, let alone a means for heat reduction from one of the electrodes.

The Office Action cites “column 4 line 20 through column 3 line 5” (sic) and refers to Figure 5 in an attempt to support the rejection. Applicants have reviewed column 3, line 5 through column 4, line 20 and confirmed that there is absolutely no reference to any means for heat reduction at all. Further, Figure 5 is a schematic electrical diagram and also does not support the rejection.

Further the Beard Jr. et al. reference simply does not disclose any indication at all regarding a problem of heat removal from the sensor assembly, and it does not disclose any means for heat reduction from an electrode as claimed. If the Beard Jr. et al. reference includes any remarks at all regarding heat reduction, it is in reference to reducing heat in drying knitted articles, but not to reducing heat for lowering any load on a component of the dryer.

In addition, reducing the temperature in a dryer overall will not serve to reduce the load on the electrodes by deposits. To this end, it is immaterial to provide for local temperature reduction that makes the temperature of the electrodes lower than the temperature of their surroundings. Thereby only, a precipitation of humidity can be effected on the electrodes, to promote removing of deposits accumulated on them.

Accordingly, the Beard Jr. et al. reference cannot serve to disclose or obviate the inventive measure of providing means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes as claimed. Thus, the rejection of claim 18 is improper, as well as any rejection of any other claim.

The Beard Jr. et al. reference simply does not include any means for heat reduction at all, let alone a means for heat reduction from an electrode as recited by independent claim 19. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Beard Jr. et al. reference in view of the Gardner et al. reference

The Office Action rejects claims 21-23 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Beard Jr. et al. reference in view of the Gardner et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least of one of the electrodes as recited by, for example, independent claim 19. This feature is important for reducing and/or preventing any film build-up on the electrodes.

As explained above, the Beard Jr. et al. reference does not teach or suggest any means for heat reduction at all, let alone a means for heat reduction from an electrode as recited by independent claim 19.

The Gardner et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Beard Jr. et al. reference.

Rather, the Gardner et al. reference merely references the use of a moisture sensor 230 at [0026] that updates a drying schedule 215 as the moisture level passes through each drying level [0031]. The Gardner et al. reference does not teach or suggest any means for heat reduction at all, let alone a means for heat reduction from an electrode as recited by independent claim 19.

The Office Action refers to paragraph [0039] in an attempt to support the rejection. However, contrary to the allegation, paragraph [0039] of the Gardner et al. reference merely describes a cooldown sequence of a wrinkle-free cycle of a laundry dryer. Paragraph [0039] of the Gardner et al. reference does not teach or suggest any means for heat reduction at all, let alone a means for heat reduction from an electrode as recited by independent claim 19, and, therefore, does not support the rejection.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 18-24, 30, and 48-54 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Howard', is written over the printed name.

James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

October 8, 2008

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com